



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMC No.1546 of 2026

Sradhananda Das Mohapatra *Petitioner (s)*
Mr. Durga Prasad Dhal, Adv.

-versus-

State of Odisha & Another *Opp. Party (s)*
Mr. Prabhu Prasanna Behera, ASC
Ms. Diptirekha Nanda, Adv.
(for private O.P. No.2)

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

Order No.

ORDER

01.

22.06.2026

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. The Petitioner, by way of the present CRLMC, seeks quashing of the entire criminal proceeding in G.R. Case No.130 of 2026, arising out of Puri Cyber Crime & Economic P.S. Case No.03 of 2026, pending in the Court of the learned S.D.J.M., Puri.
3. Heard the learned counsel for the Parties.
4. The factual backdrop of the case, shorn of unnecessary details, reveals that the Informant–Opposite Party No.2 and the present Petitioner were allegedly in a relationship from 01.12.2021 till 24.12.2024. During the course of such relationship, they are stated to have shared intimate moments. The gravamen of the accusation is that the Petitioner, by gaining the confidence of the Informant, recorded a video depicting such intimate moments, wherein the identity of the Informant was clearly discernible. It is further alleged that the Petitioner informed the Informant that the said



video had been disseminated on 03.06.2025 through various digital and social media platforms, such as WhatsApp, Instagram, Telegram, and other online forums, resulting in unauthorized publication and circulation of her private content. After her break up with the Petitioner, the informant was in severe mental trauma due to violation of her dignity and privacy. Hence, the informant was admitted in hospital and was unable to continue her studies. She was unable to communicate and work in social media and public atmosphere. She was also receiving many messages in offensive language from unknown sources. Despite the request made by the Informant not to misuse the video, the harassment was continued by the Petitioner and no further immediate action was taken. Therefore, the Informant requested to Cybercrime Cell to treat this matter as urgent and immediately find out the culprit who had circulated the video and delete the said video from all digital platforms. The Informant further requested to provide her necessary protection from further harassment and threaten and to take strict legal action against all the culprits who had circulated the video. The Informant is ready to cooperate with the investigation and will provide necessary details. On the abovementioned allegations, the F.I.R. was lodged by the Informant.

5. It transpires from the record that in the course of investigation, the Petitioner was arrested and produced before the learned S.D.J.M., Puri on 31.03.2026. Since his application for bail was not favorably



considered at the initial stage, he was remanded to custody. Thereafter, upon consideration of the fact that the parties had amicably resolved their disputes and arrived at a settlement, the learned Sessions Judge, Puri, by order dated 06.04.2026, was pleased to release the Petitioner on bail.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner further contends that the genesis of the present prosecution lies in certain misunderstandings and interpersonal differences between the Petitioner and the Informant. It is submitted that subsequent to the institution of the FIR, the parties, with the active intervention of their family members and well-wishers, have amicably settled all their disputes and buried their differences.
7. According to the learned counsel, the relationship between the parties now stands restored to a cordial footing, and they are living in peace and harmony without any trace of bitterness or hostility. In such circumstances, it is submitted that allowing the criminal proceeding to continue would neither advance the cause of justice nor serve any useful purpose.
8. Learned counsel for the Informant–Opposite Party No.2, upon instructions, acknowledges that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and differences. The informant and the accused are also physically present today before this Court and upon query they also confirmed that there was a misunderstanding and they have ironed out their differences. It is submitted that consequent upon such settlement, the Informant no longer harbours any



grievance against the Petitioner and is not inclined to pursue the prosecution any further.

9. Learned counsel further states that the Informant–Opposite Party No.2 has no objection if the entire criminal proceeding pending against the Petitioner is quashed, as continuance thereof would serve no useful purpose in the facts and circumstances of the case. On perusal of the case record, it appears that the Petitioner and the informant/ Opposite Party No.2 have filed joint affidavit dated 08.05.2026 in this CRLMC. The relevant portion of the said affidavit reads as under:

“xx xx xx xx

3. That due to some misunderstanding between the petitioner and the victim, she has lodged this FIR and now in the meantime the matter has been settled between the victim/informant and the petitioner in the presence of their well-wishers and family members and now they are living peacefully as good friends and no enmity with them.

4. That that the informant/victim/Opposite Party no. 2 does not want to proceed with this case further since the matter has been settled between them.

5. That the victim/informant/ Opposite Party no. 2 has no objection if the proceeding of this case pending against the petitioner is closed/quashed.

6. That the informant/victim/Opposite Party no. 2 has voluntarily swear this affidavit without fear and coercion.

7. That the facts stated above are true and correct to the best of their knowledge and belief.”

10. Learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State fairly submits that, having regard to the settlement entered into



between the Petitioner and the Informant–Opposite Party No.2 and the stand taken by the latter before this Court, the State does not oppose the prayer for quashing of the criminal proceeding. It is, however, submitted that the matter may be considered and decided in accordance with law and the settled principles governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction for quashment of criminal proceedings.

11. Upon a careful consideration of the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties, the terms of the joint affidavit filed before this Court, and the nature and genesis of the dispute and the tender age of the victim and the accused, this Court is satisfied that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement of their own volition. The materials on record do not indicate any element of coercion or duress in the settlement process. On the contrary, the settlement appears to be a bona fide endeavour on the part of the parties to bury their differences and restore peace and harmony, thereby rendering the continuance of adversarial proceedings largely unnecessary.

12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Another*¹, authoritatively held that in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, the High Court may quash criminal proceedings involving disputes which are predominantly personal or private in nature, where the parties have amicably resolved their differences and the continuance of the prosecution would serve no useful

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303



purpose. The Court observed that where the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak on account of a genuine settlement between the parties, and where quashment would secure the ends of justice and prevent abuse of the process of the Court, such power may appropriately be exercised. Further in the case of *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*², the Supreme Court laid down guidelines for quashing proceedings on the basis of compromise and observed that such power should be exercised where the dispute is essentially private and continuation of proceedings would be futile.

13. Similarly, in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan & Ors.*³, the Supreme Court reiterated that in cases having overwhelmingly civil or personal flavour, the High Court may quash proceedings if the parties have settled the dispute, provided the offences are not heinous or serious in nature affecting society at large.

14. In the case at hand, this Court finds that the dispute emanates from a personal relationship between the parties and does not involve any element of public injury or societal impact of such magnitude as would warrant the continuance of the prosecution notwithstanding the settlement. The materials on record, including the joint affidavit filed by the parties, unequivocally demonstrate that they have voluntarily resolved their disputes and differences and have chosen to move forward in life without any lingering acrimony. In such circumstances, the possibility of

² (2014) 6 SCC 466

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



the prosecution culminating in a meaningful conviction appears remote and bleak. Continuation of the criminal proceeding, therefore, would amount to an exercise in futility and would serve neither the cause of justice nor any legitimate prosecutorial purpose.

15. Accordingly, in exercise of the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973), and with a view to securing the ends of justice as well as preventing abuse of the process of the Court, this Court deems it fit and proper to quash the entire criminal proceeding initiated against the Petitioner in G.R. Case No.130 of 2026, arising out of Puri Cyber Crime & Economic P.S. Case No.03 of 2026, pending in the Court of the learned S.D.J.M., Puri. The said proceeding stands quashed accordingly. Accordingly, the CRLMC stands allowed and disposed of.
16. Pending application (s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge

B.Jhankar